

Appln. No. 10/645,464
Amendment dated November 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed August 19, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry of the above amendments is courteously requested in order to place all claims in this application in allowable condition and/or to place the non-allowed claims in better condition for consideration on appeal.

Claims 1 through 12 and 14 through 15 remain in this application. Claim 13 has been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

Paragraphs 2 through 10 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 3 and 10 through 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cook.

Claims 4 through 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Yi.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Hanson.

Claims 1 through 3 and 10 through 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namiki in view of Hegna.

Claims 4 through 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namiki in view of Hegna, and further in view of Yi.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Namiki in view of Hegna, and further in view of Hanson.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook.

Appln. No. 10/645,464
Amendment dated November 21, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed August 19, 2005

Claim 1 has been amended to include the requirements of claim 13, which was indicated as being allowable over the prior art in the Office Action, therefore claims 1 through 12 and 14 are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 12 is therefore respectfully requested.

Paragraph 11 of the Office Action

Paragraph 11 of the Office Action states that claim 15 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claim 1 (in its original form) into the recitation of claim 15, and therefore claim 15 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: Nov. 21, 2005

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357